



Top and bottom photos © Rich Reid / Colors of Nature, center photos: NPS

## 6. Management Options

### Introduction

The NPS recognizes that many other public agencies, private conservation organizations, and individuals successfully manage important natural and cultural resources. The NPS applauds these accomplishments, and actively encourages the expansion of conservation activities by state, local and private entities, and by other federal agencies — a “nationwide system of parks,” not just a “National Park System.” NPS management policies specify that unless direct NPS management of a studied area is identified as the clearly superior alternative, the NPS will recommend that one or more other entities assume a lead management role, and that the area not receive national park system status (NPS Management Policies, Section 1.3.4, 2001). In this case, NPS management has been determined to be infeasible, so only alternatives that do not involve NPS management are fully evaluated.

### Local and State Management Options

The NPS considered two management options that do not involve the NPS:

*Continuation of Current Programs and Policies:* Current programs and policies would remain in place, and it is assumed that current conditions and trends would continue. This is considered the “No Action” alternative for environmental analysis purposes.

*Enhanced Local and State Management:* The County of Santa Barbara and the State of California would establish new programs and take further advantage of existing programs that help protect cultural and natural resources and agricultural viability.

These two management options are considered feasible alternatives, and therefore are presented in

greater detail in the Alternatives chapter of this report. Their environmental and socioeconomic consequences are analyzed in the Environmental Assessment.

### NPS Management Options – No Longer Under Consideration

The NPS developed and considered a number of options involving NPS management, before determining that such options were not feasible. The following four management options were considered:

*National Reserve:* NPS and non-federal organizations would cooperatively manage the area.

*National Seashore:* NPS would manage significant coastal watersheds.

*National Seashore (coastal option):* NPS would manage portions of the coastal edge.

*National Preserve:* NPS would acquire certain lands within a large preserve boundary, and would offer interpretive and educational programs throughout the area, including on Vandenberg AFB.

These management options are presented on the following pages in order to more clearly document the study process. They also illustrate the study team’s conclusion that various portions of the study area contain concentrations of significant resources worthy of National Park Service consideration – the study area does not need to be considered as a whole in terms of its significance, suitability and feasibility. The boundaries drawn for each management option were based on NPS analysis of resource significance, suitability and relative management feasibility.